UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,871	01/21/2005	Norihisa Mino	10873.1596USWO	1262
	7590 05/18/200 U MANN, MUELLER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 2902			ONEILL, KARIE AMBER	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0902			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1795		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/521,871	21,871 MINO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Karie O'Neill	1795	l

	Karie O'Neill	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 May 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	-		•
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
Karie O'Neill	/Mark Ruthkosky/		
AU 1795	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1795	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that Suzuki does not teach that "the water repellant substance covers an inside of the through holes formed within the base materials, as required by Claim 1." Applicant's argument is not persuasive. Suzuki discloses all of the structural features claimed by Applicant, and on page 5 of the Final Office Action, describes wherein the water repellant substance provided on a face of the organic layer on a side opposite to a face that is bonded to the base material, and the substance fills gaps present in an inner portion of the through holes. Because there is no indication of what type of material Applicant is calling a "water repellant", any number of possibilities are disclosed by Suzuki. For instance, a catalyst bed (44a) is formed on the face of the organic layer and includes a catalyst material (48a) made of platinum or a platinum alloy, which are water repellant materials, and an electrolyte material of a solid polymer electrolyte of a fluorine system and a solid polymer electrolyte of a hydrocarbon system which are represented by the perfluorocarbon-sulfonic acid system polymer are used. The electrolyte material and catalyst particles would inherently penetrate the base material (32) and fill gaps that are present in the inner through holes.

Applicants also argues that, "the electrolyte film of Claim 1 that includes the base material having through holes is a separate part from the electrodes and different from the electrolyte in the electrodes Suzuki discloses". Applicants argument is not persuasive. The catalyst bed (44a) formed on the face of the organic layer comprises electrolyte materials made from various solid polymer electrolyte materials. The catalyst bed (44a) makes up a layer of the overall anode (40a), but is a separate part from the hydrophobic layer (52a) and diffusion zone (42a). The materials of the catalyst bed (44a) most closely resemble the materials used for the electrolyte base material (32). Therefore, the electrolyte materials containing the catalyst particles and the electrolyte materials between electrodes can be the same material and function integrally.